

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

A.H. Lundberg Associates, Inc.,)	
)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01160-JLR
Plaintiff,)	
)	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
v.)	FOR INJUNCTION, DAMAGES,
)	AND OTHER RELIEF
TSI, Inc. ,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

A.H. Lundberg Associates, Inc. hereby states its complaint against TSI, Inc. as follows:

I. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff A.H. Lundberg Associates, Inc. (“Lundberg”) is a Washington corporation with its principal place of business in Bellevue, Washington. Lundberg is a leading engineering and equipment supplier in the pulp and paper industry, wood products industry, and many other process industries. Lundberg is known for its pollution compliance solutions.

2. Defendant TSI, Inc. (“TSI”) is a Washington corporation with its principal place of business in Lynnwood, Washington. Upon information and belief, TSI designs and builds equipment for automated plants in the engineered wood and biomass industries. TSI claims to offer pollution compliance systems in competition with Lundberg.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1338(b). This Court has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because all

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
DAMAGES, AND OTHER RELIEF - 1

LANE POWELL pc
1420 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 4200
P.O. BOX 91302
SEATTLE, WA 98111-9402
206.223.7000 FAX: 206.223.7107

claims in suit are so related that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) because TSI resides in this judicial district.

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Lundberg as an Innovator in Producing Environmentally Sound Equipment

4. Lundberg is a leading engineering and equipment supplier in the pulp and paper and other industries. Lundberg supplies customized air pollution control systems and evaporation technology as well as practical, economically sound solutions for energy efficiency and chemical processing.

5. The history of Lundberg, and the company's wealth of experience, dates back to the 1930's when Alerick Halvar Lundberg started working for a sulfite pulp manufacturer. Alerick Lundberg formed A.H. Lundberg, Inc. in 1951, acting as a representative for some of the most important companies in the pulping industry.

6. Starting in the 1950's Lundberg and associated companies began to operate as a worldwide presence; the Lundberg expertise was recognized across the globe, and, at times, Lundberg has had related affiliates in Canada, Portugal, Austria, Spain, and Belgium, in addition to the United States.

7. In 2002, Lundberg acquired the intellectual property of Geoenergy International Corporation ("Geoenergy®"), which designed and supplied environmental control systems to a variety of industries. Of primary importance in this acquisition, were Geoenergy®'s proprietary designs for a Wet Electrostatic Precipitator ("Wet ESP"), which Lundberg used for fine particulate emissions control in industrial applications.

8. Lundberg's Wet ESPs feature a special E-Tube® design with a proprietary disk-in-tube electrode configuration. Lundberg's Wet ESPs can be used for wood dryers in the panelboard and wood pellet industries, sewage sludge incinerators, fiberglass/mineral wool forming operations, hazardous waste incinerators, biomass-fired boilers, and fine particle sources at many other process applications.

1 9. In addition to the Wet ESPs, Lundberg also acquired and built dedicated thermal
 2 oxidizer systems for harsh industrial environments. These Lundberg systems are designed to
 3 combust a wide variety of industrial pollutants and to meet or exceed all environmental
 4 requirements. Lundberg's GeoTherm® Regenerative Thermal Oxidizers ("RTO") and
 5 GeoCat® Regenerative Catalytic Oxidizers ("RCO") are a proven economical and energy-
 6 efficient family of technologies designed to meet this challenge.

7 10. Lundberg conducts business in virtually every part of the world and has become
 8 known as a leader in environmental solutions. Lundberg has supplied its Wet ESP, RTO, and
 9 RCO technology to manufacturers across a variety of industries. Since the mid-1980s,
 10 Geoenergy/Lundberg has installed more Wet ESPs in North America than any other company.
 11 Geoenergy was the first company to introduce a tube-type Wet ESP into the wood products
 12 industry.

13 **B. TSI's Agreement to Protect Lundberg's Trade Secrets**

14 11. TSI opened in 1992 to provide more effective machines and systems for the
 15 engineered wood and biomass industries.

16 12. TSI entered into a business relationship with Lundberg beginning in 2007 and
 17 was also a customer of Lundberg's. TSI relied on Lundberg's products for use with the
 18 engineered wood and biomass wood dryer systems that TSI designed and supplied. TSI
 19 purchased Wet ESP, RTO, and RCO products from Lundberg to sell to customers of TSI.

20 13. As part of their business relationship, TSI and Lundberg entered into a non-
 21 disclosure agreement drafted by TSI. *See* Ex. 1. The non-disclosure agreement stated that "[i]n
 22 connection with any Project, the parties desire to protect their proprietary rights and any
 23 confidential information to be shared between them and desire to give each other written
 24 assurances with respect to the confidentiality, nondisclosure and use of such information."

25 14. TSI's non-disclosure agreement with Lundberg explicitly recognized
 26 Lundberg's "plans, trade secrets, data, know-how, concepts, processes, [and] techniques" along
 27 with many other forms of "Confidential Information." Under the non-disclosure agreement,
 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
 DAMAGES, AND OTHER RELIEF - 3

1 TSI agreed that all of Lundberg's trade secrets and other Confidential Information would
 2 remain Lundberg's "exclusive property." TSI also agreed not to use any of Lundberg's
 3 Confidential Information "for any purpose other than the Project" with Lundberg.

4 15. TSI's obligations under the non-disclosure agreement were perpetual; TSI
 5 agreed to protect and not to misuse any of Lundberg's trade secrets or Confidential Information
 6 "for as long as any Confidential Information disclosed by the parties to each other is in
 7 possession or knowledge of the recipient."

8 16. William B. Teal, the President of TSI, executed the non-disclosure agreement on
 9 July 30, 2012.

10 **C. TSI's Hire of Former Lundberg Employee, Gary Raemhild**

11 17. Gary Raemhild was a principal of Geoenergy® who Lundberg hired shortly
 12 after Lundberg's acquisition of Geoenergy®'s assets. Raemhild remained with Lundberg
 13 helping to build and improve Lundberg's Wet ESP and other systems until August 2012. He
 14 was a critical part of Lundberg's Geoenergy® team.

15 18. As part of his employment for Lundberg, Raemhild signed a Confidentiality,
 16 Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement on July 24, 2003. *See* Ex. 2. By this
 17 Agreement, Raemhild "acknowledge[d] that by virtue of his employment and position with
 18 [Lundberg], [Raemhild] has direct access to a substantial portion of [Lundberg's] confidential
 19 business records and information, the disclosure of which to [Lundberg's] competitors or other
 20 third parties could be highly detrimental to [Lundberg]." Raemhild explicitly agreed to protect
 21 as confidential "existing and to-be-developed or acquired product designs and services, for all
 22 [Lundberg] products, systems, and services including regenerative thermal oxidizers, regenerative
 23 catalytic oxidizers, and wet electrostatic precipitators." To this end, Raemhild agreed that he
 24 would "not, during or at any time after the termination of his employment with [Lundberg],
 25 regardless of the reason for such termination, disclose [Lundberg's] Confidential Information to
 26 any person, firm, corporation, association or other entity, for any reason." Importantly,
 27

1 Raemhild agreed and was obligated not to “remove from [Lundberg’s] premises (physically or
2 electronically) any Confidential Information.”

3 19. In August 2012, Raemhild resigned from Lundberg to work for TSI. Prior to
4 resigning from Lundberg, Raemhild violated his fiduciary duty and obligations to Lundberg,
5 for the benefit of TSI. Lundberg had no knowledge of Raemhild’s breaches of fiduciary duty.

6 20. On August 17, 2012, Lundberg sent Raemhild, who was then employed by TSI,
7 a letter reminding him of his confidentiality, noncompetition, and nondisclosure obligations to
8 Lundberg.

9 **D. TSI Steals Lundberg’s Technology and Sells it as TSI’s Own**

10 21. Immediately after TSI hired Raemhild, TSI began offering Wet ESPs, RTOs,
11 and RCOs. This new technology constitutes TSI’s entire pollution abatement product line.

12 22. Beginning after Raemhild’s hire in the fall of 2012, TSI’s website began to
13 feature pictures of TSI’s “new” technology, which demonstrated direct copying of Lundberg’s
14 designs. The equipment shown on TSI’s website is actually Lundberg’s, designed by
15 Geoenergy®/Lundberg and manufactured under contract for Lundberg. Lundberg engineered,
16 manufactured, and installed some of the equipment for TSI at a pellet mill in Waycross, GA, in
17 its capacity as a subcontractor for TSI. On its website, TSI misrepresents the nature of its
18 products by claiming the Lundberg products as its own. The only reason TSI can offer the
19 environmental control products is because it learned Lundberg’s trade secrets and hired
20 Raemhild, without whom TSI could not have designed its own products. TSI’s website falsely
21 designates the origin of TSI’s goods; TSI is reverse passing off Lundberg’s equipment as its
22 own.

23 23. TSI’s products are copied from the Lundberg products designs based on
24 information and drawings provided from Raemhild and Jarrad Markley, another former
25 Lundberg employee. TSI’s design of its equipment using the Lundberg trade secrets and
26 confidential information violates TSI’s non-disclosure agreement with Lundberg. TSI also
27 induced and/or aided and abetted Raemhild to violate Confidentiality, Noncompetition and

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
DAMAGES, AND OTHER RELIEF - 5

LANE POWELL PC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 4200
P.O. BOX 91302
SEATTLE, WA 98111-9402
206.223.7000 FAX: 206.223.7107

1 Nonsolicitation Agreement with Lundberg and his fiduciary obligations. Similarly, TSI also
2 induced and aided Markley to breach his confidentiality obligations arising from his
3 employment agreement with Lundberg. The actual design of TSI's products demonstrate that,
4 in violation of the governing agreements, Raemhild and Markley shared Lundberg's
5 confidential design information and trade secrets which TSI copied and used to compete with
6 Lundberg.

7 24. TSI's own press release confirms its willful disregard of obligations to protect
8 Lundberg's trade secrets and confidential information. *See* Ex. 3. TSI's press release issued in
9 November 2013 states "TSI Launches Emissions Control," which acknowledges that TSI was
10 not providing the disputed technology before hiring the former Lundberg employees and
11 breaching its confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement and Raemhild's Confidentiality,
12 Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement. The press release states that TSI "recently
13 launched its own in-house division for the production of Emission Control Systems,
14 specifically wet electrostatic precipitators (Wet ESPS)."

15 25. Slandering Lundberg, the press release goes on to state that TSI has "a long
16 history of working with other suppliers of this equipment . . . however, . . . we began to see
17 shortcomings in design that we were powerless to address and were often left holding the bag
18 for performance issues as a result. The solution was to take matters into our own hands and
19 develop systems that we knew would match the high standards we implement in our other
20 products." The press release claims that TSI developed its own systems, but that is a
21 misrepresentation. Rather, TSI copied Lundberg's system and used confidential information
22 and trade secrets learned from Lundberg employees. TSI's claim to have taken matters into its
23 own hands and developed its own systems falsely describes the nature of its Wet ESP
24 technology and reverse passes off Lundberg's innovations as TSI's own.

25 26. The TSI press release also boasts that "TSI has hired two highly experience
26 executives from the emission control industry, Gary Raemhild and Jarrad Markley, and tasked
27 them with recruiting the staff and setting up a process control and engineering group with the
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
DAMAGES, AND OTHER RELIEF - 6

existing TSI structure.” By asking Raemhild and Markely to develop a product line by using Lundberg’s technology, TSI induced Raemhild to breach his Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement and induced Raemhild to violate his duty of confidentiality owed to Lundberg.

27. As if the prior phrasing did not say enough about TSI’s conduct, TSI’s press release also confirms TSI’s misuse of Lundberg’s trade secrets and confidential information. Specifically, TSI claims “several key improvements.” The press release does not list what the alleged “improvements” are. These statements, along with the manner in which TSI created its technology, misrepresent the nature, quality, and characteristics of Lundberg’s goods to the public.

28. In addition to hiring Lundberg’s key employee, aiding and abetting Raemhild and Markely to breach their obligations not to disclose Lundberg’s confidences and trade secrets, copying Lundberg’s technology, and misusing Lundberg’s trade secrets, TSI used Raemhild’s confidential knowledge of Lundberg’s customers and pending proposals to obtain contracts to sell products that TSI would not have obtained without using Raemhild’s confidential knowledge in breach of his Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement. Further, TSI and Raemhild approached clients and potential clients who had been working with Lundberg, tortiously interfering with Lundberg’s contractual relations.

IV. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN, FALSE DESCRIPTION UNDER 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)

29. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-28 stated above.

30. By marketing Lundberg’s technology as TSI’s own where TSI has only slightly modified the technology, TSI is reverse passing off Lundberg’s equipment and innovations. TSI’s false claims to have designed its system misrepresent the nature, characteristics, qualities, and origin of its goods because, in fact, TSI stole and used Lundberg’s design along with trade secrets and confidential and proprietary information from Raemhild.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
DAMAGES, AND OTHER RELIEF - 7

1 31. By claiming “improvements” in the Wet ESP design without stating what these
2 improvements are, TSI is falsely describing and misrepresenting its products.

3 32. TSI has made these misrepresentations publicly, both on its website and in a
4 press release beginning in 2013 and continuing through the present.

5 33. TSI’s descriptions of its products are likely to cause mistake and to deceive as to
6 the origin of its goods. TSI never states where the design of its products came from or how it
7 began to offer the technology.

8 34. TSI’s descriptions of its products misrepresent the nature, characteristics, and
9 qualities of its goods and commercial activities.

10 35. TSI’s conduct violates section 1125(a) and has damaged Lundberg.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF CONTRACT**

12 36. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-35 stated above.

13 37. Lundberg and TSI entered into a valid non-disclosure agreement drafted by TSI
14 on July 30, 2012.

15 38. Among other obligations, TSI agreed to protect Lundberg’s proprietary rights,
16 trade secrets, and confidential information both during and after the agreement. Raemhild and
17 Markley also agreed to protect Lundberg’s information when they signed the Confidentiality,
18 Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement and employment agreement, respectively.

19 39. TSI breached its non-disclosure agreement when it incorporated Lundberg’s
20 proprietary rights, trade secrets, and confidential information into TSI’s technology and
21 equipment. TSI also induced Raemhild and Markley to breach their confidentiality agreements
22 when it hired Raemhild away from Lundberg and tasked him and Markley with developing a
23 competing Wet ESP product line for TSI that incorporated Lundberg’s trade secrets and
24 confidential designs.

25 40. TSI’s conduct violates the non-disclosure agreement, Raemhild’s
26 Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement, and Markley’s employment
27 agreement, and has damaged Lundberg.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
DAMAGES, AND OTHER RELIEF - 8

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – UNJUST ENRICHMENT

41. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-40 stated above.

42. To the extent that TSI did not agree, expressly or by implication, to protect and not to use Lundberg's proprietary rights, trade secrets, and confidential information, a legal obligation to limit TSI's misuse can be implied by law. This obligation is echoed in the confidentiality, noncompetition, and nondisclosure obligations of Raemhild, who TSI hired away from Lundberg. Similarly, these obligations also appear in Markley's employment agreement. By hiring Raemhild and Markley to build off of Lundberg's technology designs to create competing models for TSI, TSI induced Raemhild and Markley to breach their confidentiality agreements.

43. TSI benefitted from the use of Lundberg's proprietary rights, trade secrets, and confidential information by incorporating this information into TSI's equipment. TSI knew of the benefit of Lundberg's information because the misuse allowed TSI to launch a new in-house division. TSI boasted about the efficiency and efficacy of this new division and TSI's "improvements" in technology. TSI also understood the benefit of hiring Raemhild and Markley and gaining the value of the confidential information that they knew about Lundberg and its potential and actual customers. TSI announced Raemhild's and Markley's hire in a press release. In violation of Raemhild's Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement and Markley's employment agreement, TSI reaped the benefit of their knowledge of Lundberg's systems when Raemhild and Markley helped design a competing system for TSI. In addition, TSI reaped the benefit of information about Lundberg's customers and contacts when it began pitching to these contacts.

44. Such enrichment to TSI was at Lundberg's expense. TSI slammed Lundberg in TSI's press release, solicited Lundberg's customers, and never credited Lundberg for the technology.

45. TSI's conduct constitutes unjust enrichment and has damaged Lundberg.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – MISAPPROPRIATION OF TRADE SECRETS
UNDER RCW 19.108

46. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-45 stated above.

47. TSI acknowledged that it was obligated to protect Lundberg's trade secrets in the July 30, 2012 non-disclosure agreement.

48. Lundberg's know-how, expertise, processes, methods, technology, innovations, customer lists and other information constitute trade secrets because the information was not known in the industry, as confirmed by the TSI non-disclosure agreement, Raemhild's Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement, and Markley's employment agreement. Lundberg protected its trade secrets with these contractual agreements and by allowing access to the information to only employees who needed to know the information to design and improve it. Lundberg's information derived value from being kept secret because Lundberg was hired as a supplier of technology to other companies across various industries who did not possess the same information and technology, including TSI.

49. TSI misappropriated Lundberg's trade secrets when TSI used the trade secrets without express or implied consent by Lundberg. TSI also misappropriated Lundberg's trade secrets when it hired Raemhild and Markley to use their knowledge of Lundberg's trade secrets to build competing technology for TSI.

50. TSI knew that its use of Lundberg's trade secrets was improper because TSI was bound by the non-disclosure agreement with Lundberg. Therefore, TSI acquired Lundberg's trade secrets under circumstances giving rise to a duty to maintain its secrecy and limit its use.

51. TSI also knew that its use of Lundberg's trade secrets was improper because TSI acquired the information from Raemhild who was under a duty not to compete with Lundberg and to protect Lundberg's information. Markley was also under a duty to protect Lundberg's information. Thus, TSI acquired Lundberg's trade secrets while having reason to know that Raemhild and Markley should have protected Lundberg's trade secrets and was breaching their duties to maintain the trade secrets in secrecy.

52. TSI's conduct constitutes trade secret misappropriation and has damaged Lundberg.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – AIDING AND ABETTING BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

53. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-52 stated above.

54. Raemhild owed Lundberg fiduciary duties of loyalty and to not disclose, divulge, or misappropriate trade secrets due to his employment relationship and Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement with Lundberg.

55, Raemhild was employed by Lundberg and subject to these fiduciary duties up to when he resigned from Lundberg in August 2012. Raemhild violated his fiduciary duties to Lundberg for the benefit of TSI.

56. At all relevant times, TSI had actual knowledge of Raemhild's fiduciary duties to Lundberg, and TSI had actual knowledge that Raemhild breached his fiduciary duties for the benefit of TSI.

57. TSI provided substantial assistance to aid and abet Raemhild in the breach of his fiduciary duties to Lundberg.

58. TSI benefited from its wrongful collusion with Raemhild by gaining access to project clients and knowledge about Lundberg's confidential technology. By aiding and abetting Raemhild's breach of fiduciary duties to Lundberg, TSI was able to accelerate its entrance into the marketplace and compete directly with Lundberg. TSI's collusion with Raemhild caused Lundberg to lose projects, lose value in its trade secrets, and reduce Lundberg's competitive position in the marketplace.

59. TSI's conduct constitutes aiding and abetting Raemhild's breach of fiduciary duties to Lundberg and has damaged Lundberg.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION – TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH
PROSPECTIVE AND ACTUAL CONTRACTS**

60. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-52 stated above.

61. Lundberg had valid contracts and economic expectancies with TSI and others to provide Lundberg's technology. Specifically, Lundberg expected to be hired for projects for German Pellet and Zilkha. TSI ended up stealing both of these projects either immediately before or shortly after Raemhild's departure from Lundberg and move to TSI. Upon information and belief, TSI also interfered with other Lundberg contracts and expectancies.

62. TSI knew about these contracts and expectancies because TSI had been in a business relationship with Lundberg for years and TSI had solicited Lundberg to be a subcontractor to TSI on the German Pellet project. In addition, TSI learned of Lundberg's contracts and expectancies when it began negotiating with Raemhild to hire him away from Lundberg. Raemhild had been the primary point of contact for the Zilkha job while he was at Lundberg.

63. TSI intended to interfere with Lundberg's contracts and expectancies; TSI purposefully hired Raemhild and developed competing technology using Lundberg's trade secrets. TSI then bragged about its "improvements" to the public. By taking this course of action, TSI breached its own non-disclosure agreement with Lundberg and induced Raemhild to breach his Confidentiality, Noncompetition and Nonsolicitation Agreement. TSI took advantage of Raemhild's breach by exploiting his knowledge of Lundberg's trade secrets and confidential information to develop competing technology and poach Lundberg customers and expectancies.

64. In addition to interfering with Lundberg's contracts and expectancies via TSI's website and press releases, TSI also contacted and solicited potential and actual Lundberg customers. As an example, TSI could only have presented a Wet ESP product to Zilkha, one of Lundberg's potential clients, with Raemhild's help. Before Raemhild left Lundberg for TSI, TSI did not offer a Wet ESP and could not have completed the Zilkha project.

65. TSI's interference was improper because TSI and Raemhild were under obligation to protect Lundberg's proprietary rights, trade secrets, and confidential information. Further, TSI had worked with Lundberg in a business relationship for years prior to the interference.

66. TSI's conduct constitutes tortious inference with prospective and actual contracts and has damaged Lundberg.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – VIOLATION OF THE WASHINGTON
CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT UNDER RCW 19.86**

67. Lundberg repeats, realleges, and incorporates ¶¶ 1-66 stated above.

68. TSI committed an unfair and deceptive act in trade and commerce when it misappropriated and incorporated into its technology Lundberg's confidential information and trade secrets and later offered this technology for sale as TSI's own. TSI's conduct violates the Lanham Act and RCW 19.108 and is deceptive and unfair on its face.

69. TSI's actions have the capacity to materially deceive a substantial portion of the public because TSI has made and continues to make public representations about its technology that would lead consumers to believe that (1) TSI owns the technology and its use is authorized; (2) TSI designed the technology; (3) TSI improved existing technology; and (4) TSI was authorized to hire Raemhild to build competing technology. TSI's actions violate the Lanham Act, a statute that has a public interest impact.

70. TSI's unfair and deceptive actions have injured Lundberg in its business and property. TSI's unauthorized incorporation, use, and sale of Lundberg's information and technology both devalues Lundberg's technology and undermines the reputation and goodwill of Lundberg's business while allowing TSI to profit at the same time. TSI's actions also deprived Lundberg its property and/or intellectual property rights.

71. There is a causal link between TSI's unfair and deceptive actions and the injury Lundberg has suffered because TSI manufactured and offered for sale Lundberg's proprietary technology without Lundberg's authorization and with disregard for its reputation and trade

1 secret rights. TSI has been unjustly enriched by the offer for sale of property and trade secrets
2 that do not belong to TSI and has impaired Lundberg's ability to control its own property.

3 72. TSI's conduct constitutes a violation of the Washington Consumer Protection
4 Act and has damaged Lundberg.

5 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, plaintiff A.H. Lundberg Associates, Inc. prays for relief as follows:

- 7 1. For a judgment against TSI;
- 8 2. For an injunction against TSI that prohibits TSI from manufacturing, selling,
9 incorporating, or otherwise using Lundberg's proprietary and confidential
10 information and trade secrets.
- 11 3. For damages against TSI in an amount to be determined at trial;
- 12 4. For reasonable attorneys' fees and the costs of pursuing Lundberg's claims as
13 may be allowed by law; and;
- 14 5. Such other and further relief as the Court determines is just and proper.
- 15

16 DATED: August 26, 2015

17 LANE POWELL PC

18
19 By /s/ Randall P. Beighle
20 Randall P. Beighle, WSBA No. 13421
21 Tiffany Scott Connors, WSBA No. 41740
22 Brian G. Bodine, WSBA No. 22414
23 Telephone: 206.223.7000
24 Facsimile: 206.223.7107
25 Attorneys for Plaintiff A.H. Lundberg Associates,
26 Inc.
27

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington and the United States that on the 26th day of August, 2015, I caused to be served a copy of the attached document to the following counsel in the manner indicated below at the following address:

Kenneth W. Hart, WSBA No. 15511
Emilia L. Sweeney, WSBA No. 23371
Melissa Cunningham WSBA No. 46537
Carney Badley Spellman P.S.
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3600
Seattle WA 98104-7010
Phone: (206) 622-8020
Fax: (206) 467-8215
E-mail: sweeney@carneylaw.com
E-mail: hart@carneylaw.com
E-mail: Cunningham@carneylaw.com

☒ by CM/ECF
☐ by Electronic Mail
☐ by Facsimile Transmission
☐ by First Class Mail
☐ by Hand Delivery
☐ by Overnight Delivery

DATED this 26th day of August, 2015.


Terry Intlekofer